

existence we have no evidence and from which we have no material except that which is contained in the present final work. My own inclination is to think that this whole approach which has been given up regarding other books largely, but is still to quite an extent held by many in relation to the Old Testament, is not scientific at all, but but pseudo-scientific. Wellhausen theory is losing ground constantly would it not be wise to reconsider the whole matter of the source divisions which is taken up by the Wellhausen, and consider whether O.T. study was not here off on an entirely wrong track. Would it not be better to go back to the point ~~wt~~ at which this track began, and see whether, perhaps the previous view was actually better than the wrong direction in which study went for so long a time.

Our subject tonight is the scientific approach to the O.T. Now just what do we mean by scientific approach? ~~The scientific~~ scientific approach to any subject is the approach which is vitally interested in facts. It is not the approach which builds up beautiful theories and then tried to hunt for facts to discover the theories. It is an approach which is interested in facts and examines as many facts as possible. Then builds hypotheses on the basis of these facts, and looks for more facts by which to test the hypotheses and is ~~always~~ ready to throw aside a hypothesis and to adopt a new one, if it proves not to check with new facts. I think it can safely be said that the ~~divisive~~ divisive method of O.T. study is one which has very few actual facts in its favor, and one which on the other hand has any number of facts against it. I incline to think that it would better be called pseudo-scientific than scientific and that it would be something that it would be well to discard altogether. What then is to be the approach toward the O.T.? The view held by Jews and Christians through the ages has been that this book is different from other books. As a matter of fact, if we examined <sup>the</sup> a book, it is ~~quite~~ quite obvious that it is different from any other book. There is a unity to this book, even though written by many different individuals at different times, ~~there~~ is a general similarity of viewpoint, and there is also in it a claim which is made in the first chapter of the